

248

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/677,403	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GULATI, SANDEEP	
	<b>Examiner</b> Young J. Kim	<b>Art Unit</b> 1637	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Non-Final

(1) Young J. Kim.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Carl Kukkonen.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 June 2004

**Time:** 1:15

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, 101, and 102(a) and (e)*

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

*Garini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,817,462)*


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Kukkonen discussed the difference between the instant invention and the invention of the '462 patent. Specifically, Mr. Kukkonen pointed out that the instant invention employs the interferometric unit on a digitized output, while the invention of the '462 patent employs the interferometric unit in order to obtain a digitized output, thus differing in the process and the configuration of the inventions. Additionally, the rejection of claim 5 was agreed to be withdrawn when amended to make the computer program product comprised on a computer readable medium. .